



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

of Argyll, which, in conclusion, we heartily commend to their thoughtful consideration. In the volume entitled "The Reign of Law," under the seventh head, "Law in Politics," is this paragraph: "The epoch of conquering races destroying the governments and reconstructing the populations of the world is an epoch which has passed away. Whatever causes there may be now of political decline are causes never brought to such rough detection, and never ending in catastrophe so complete. Yet in modern days a condition of stagnation and decline has been the actual condition of many political societies for long periods of time. It is a condition prepared always by ignorance or neglect of some moral or economical laws, and determined by a long perseverance in a corresponding course of conduct. Then the laws which have been neglected assert themselves. In the last generation, and in our own time, the Old and the New World have each afforded memorable examples of the reign of law on the course of political events. Institutions *maintained against the natural progress of society* have foundered amid fanatic storms. Other institutions, *upheld and cherished against justice and humanity and conscience*, have yielded only to the scourge of war."

EDWARD BROOKS.

---

ART. VI.—PIERRE BAYLE.

PIERRE BAYLE was born in 1647, in the days of Mazarin and the Fronde. He saw the rising of the sun of Louis XIV., its meridian splendor, *nec pluribus impar*, and its disastrous setting at Blenheim and Ramillies. In English history his life extends from the execution of Charles I. through the reigns of Cromwell, Charles II., James, William and Mary, to Queen Anne. He belongs to the most remarkable century the world has seen since the one we date from,—a century that has on its muster-roll such names as Galileo, Kepler, Newton, Bacon, Descartes, Spinoza, Locke, Leibnitz, Shakespeare, Cervantes, Molière, and many more who would have been giants in any other company. A century of great changes as well as of great men, it bridges

the passage from mediæval to modern times. All the nations were in a turmoil with wars, revolutions, persecutions, and bitter theological disputes, — a period we recommend to the notice of newspaper reporters and speech-makers, who “always take their hats off when they allude to this century,” and cant in a sad yet boastful tone of the terrible mental strain and excitement of our times.

It was in the fifteenth century, when Copernicus took the earth from its fixed position in the centre of the universe, and sent it whirling through space, that the series of events began which unmoored society from its anchorage of a thousand years, to drift we do not yet know where. How wonderful these events seem if we try to detach them from their somewhat musty association with the primers and readers of our school-days. De Gama and Columbus triple the size of the world; Gutenberg or Faust make a new world of ideas easy of access. A new form of doctrinal and practical religion is introduced, thanks to their invention, for it was printer’s ink Luther threw at the Devil. Of course, neither the ideas nor the men that had satisfied the wants of half a hemisphere were sufficient for the entire globe. The social equilibrium was disturbed as well as the moral. A rebellion commenced against tradition and authority, that has lasted three hundred years. It is tolerably accurate to say that the sixteenth century undertook to overthrow authority in religion; in the seventeenth, the attack was on authority in philosophy; in the eighteenth, on hereditary government and rank. There are symptoms that capital, or rather property, may be the object of the campaign of the nineteenth. When property is put down, the aggressive movement will be complete, unless we should think it necessary to abolish education, talent, and character, and proceed, as the late M. Proudhon phrased it, to the liquidation of society. Meantime we may consider that this great rebellion is triumphant with us, for authority is held in no respect whatever if it interferes with the wants, wishes, or even whims of the noisy part of the public. Rogues set civil laws at defiance with impunity; fools ridicule the laws of nature and of science, or pretend to think that conditions peculiar to themselves will, in some inexplicable way, upset all past experience; and, unluckily,

these rogues and fools generally belong to the class of "prominent men" who govern the country.

In the seventeenth century the new tide in the affairs of mankind ran very swiftly. The old manners, habits, and beliefs yielded rapidly to our modern ways. Trade brought with it new luxuries and new wants, and was recognized as one of the most important affairs of state. The nature and function of money began to be understood. Gold, the great stimulus to exertion and enterprise, poured in. The steady advance in prices changed the relative conditions of life. Wealth, easily obtained, attacked the exclusiveness of birth; cheap books, the exclusiveness of the learned.\* The coarseness and rustic brutality of the civil wars gave place to mildness and civility, — *à une douceur et civilité extrême*. After 1675 Bayle said, "We live in a *siècle philosophique*." There was a general awakening of the mind; a delight with the wonders already accomplished, and a lively hope of greater wonders to come; a millennial feeling such as sprang up again in the first days of the French Revolution. At both periods enthusiastic philosophers, carried away by the rapid progress of science, believed that some means would yet be discovered to prolong human life indefinitely.

Bayle was educated under the old system, but lived to learn a new philosophy, a new science, to enjoy a new literature, to adopt new customs, new manners, a new dress, and even a new diet.†

We have come to consider novelty so good a thing in itself, irrespective of its merits, that it is difficult to imagine a period when ninety-nine men out of a hundred thought alike and had inherited their thoughts. Beliefs had been bred-in and become instinctive. Scholars yielded with a childlike submission to the *dicta* of a dead master. If the great Albert or the angelic Thomas had said that black was white, black *was* white, and there was an end of it. True to this feeling, the conservatives

\* A Spanish lady of rank complained that any low fellow might have the beautiful thoughts of Gratian for a crown. — BAYLE'S *Nouvelles*.

† Turnips, carrots, parsnips, green peas, did not come into use until the middle of the seventeenth century. So with coffee, chocolate, and tea. "1660, 25th Sept. I did send for a cup of tea, a China drink of which I never had drank before." — PEPYS, Vol. I. 110.

resisted fiercely every innovation. "Who are you who pretend to know more than your ancestors?" shouted the old physicians when the new school proclaimed Harvey's theory of the circulation. "Shall we suffer practitioners of three days' standing to insult the old doctrines and drive us out of a possession of a thousand years?" The doctrines of Aristotle, as interpreted by them, had been so interwoven with the doctrines of the Church, that to doubt him on any point was heresy. The study of nature and meditations on the mind were perilous if resulting in new views. Astrology was more orthodox than astronomy on the Copernican system. Severe penalties impended over the heads of students who broke with the old beliefs. In 1624 the Parliament of Paris decreed death to all who should teach maxims opposed to Aristotle and approved authors. Thirteen years later Descartes thought himself safer in Holland than in France. Even in Holland he was obliged to seek the protection of the local magistrates and of the French ambassador against the violence of Voet, a bigoted Protestant professor and preacher, who also thundered against Harvey's theory as irreligious. In 1656 Pascal wrote of the earth as the centre of the universe, although he knew that Galileo was right. Even in 1683 the comedian Reynard says that the Copernican system was considered heretical in Paris; and still later, Leibnitz forgot himself so far as to speak of the Newtonian theory as immoral. But why should we wonder? Even in our enlightened era, philosophers, when they find their arguments too feeble to upset the positions of a rival, have recourse to the "logio which is not of this world," and pronounce them wicked. Darwin is met with the charge of atheism, and geologists lecture with Genesis suspended over their heads by well-meaning people with more zeal than wisdom. And so it will be to the end. When we were told, "the poor ye have always with you," deficiency of intellect was meant quite as much as lack of goods. But science cannot be put down; it will move in spite of the Church, and the ground it once has occupied it never loses. The Académie des Sciences was established in 1666; the Royal Society, a year or two earlier. About the same time the "Journal des Savans," first-born of scientific journals, was published: it is still in existence. The

movement party was full of energy, and had the hearty assistance of the author and the *bel esprit*. Molière ridiculed the old school, who, like the *Malade Imaginaire* when he took his degree in medicine, swore,

Essere in omnibus  
Consultationibus,  
Ancieni aviso  
Aut bono  
Aut mauvaiso.

A great point with the new school was to introduce science to the *gens du monde*; "to rub off the rust of pedantry and replace it by an attractive varnish of liveliness and elegance." Scientific treatises were written in French instead of Latin. The Abbé Gérard composed a philosophy for the use of persons of quality. Fontenelle's *Plurality of Worlds* is one of the earliest efforts to make astronomy interesting to the ordinary reader, and one of the most successful. It is still pleasant reading, and not the less so because it is based upon Descartes' theory of *tourbillons*. This was the beginning of the "popularization" of science (the word is theirs). We have seen the movement reach its vulgarization. At a time when research is more active and sound than ever before, the public is fed with a mixture of science and water, too weak to afford substantial nourishment, which has made a great many minds rickety, and peculiarly susceptible to attacks of spiritualism or any other epidemic of folly that may be going about.

Another inherited weakness of the seventeenth century was a love of subtlety in argument, often only ingenious and idle quibbling. Dialectics were to the scholar what fencing was to the gentleman, a pleasant and exciting exercise, becoming his station in life, enabling him to gratify the excessive pugnacity of the period. The doctors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, like the knights in the *Morte d'Arthur*, never met without a tussle. "Sir Knight, make thee ready to joust with me," and they went at it in earnest, "tracing and traversing full mightily and wisely," while the learned made a ring and passed critical judgment upon the strokes. The religious history of the seventeenth century is full of these personal encounters, some of them in open lists, in the presence of great ladies. De

Retz relates in his memoirs a theological passage of arms, in which he engaged Mestrezat, the minister of Charenton, before Mme. de Rambure, Turenne, and other distinguished people. In 1678 Claude and Bossuet, each the champion of his sect, disputed on the authority of the Church before Mlle. De Duras, and Claude refuted Nicolle's tract on Transubstantiation, at the request of Mlle. De Turenne. In these oral discussions there was some courtesy and respect shown, but when theologians attacked each other with the pen the fight was merciless. "Theologians never bite without taking a piece out," said Bayle; "Cain killed Abel in a religious quarrel." After the Thirty Years' War the theological controversies of Western Europe equalled in violence the contests of the monks of Constantinople in the fourth century. This moral epidemic raged through the seventeenth century. There was so much feeling in the strife, that invective became the favorite method of reasoning. "The Pope's the whore of Babylon," and "Calvinismus bestiarum religio," are specimens of the arguments commonly employed. Bayle suggested that "to use abuse in ordinary controversy was a kind of sacrilege; it was robbing the Church." Arminianism, Jansenism, Quietism, and, above all, persecution, had kept up the stock of "saints of the old-time enthusiastic breed." After the Revocation of the Edict, Holland swarmed with refugees of every shade of opinion, and buzzed like a hornet's-nest with angry controversy. In 1684 Bayle writes that books of theology sell better than any others. "There are as many as twenty editions of some of them; I do not think that Molière's comedies or the satires of M. Despréaux will ever go as far." This doctrinal animosity appeared in every act of life. "You can tell the sect of a grammarian from the very rudiments of his grammar"; and Bayle advises in some pamphlet "each Protestant prince to get a Protestant astronomer to recommend the change of style which they would have adopted long since had not a Pope been the author of it." The temper of the times was affected; scientific and literary men were almost as bitter as theologians. Like the Homeric heroes, they considered abuse a becoming prelude to battle. Even when the match began in play it ended in bad blood and bad words. The *vir celeberrime et eruditissime* of the first

interchange of pamphlets became a fool, a villain, and an atheist before the last surrebutter was put in. One is reminded of Chucks, the boatswain, in Marryat's "Peter Simple," who always began a reproof to his sailors with, "My dear man," and ended with, "Take that, you d—d 'haymaking son of a sea-cook." Bayle himself, the most moderate of men, but the ablest dialectician of his day, wore the champion's belt and was daily challenged to fight for it. In his room at Rotterdam, "chez Mlle. Wits sur le Schepesmaker's Have," he sat like Goldsmith's porcupine, "self-collected, with a quill pointed against every opposer." The day before his death he sent to press a pamphlet aimed at Le Clerc, and spent the evening on a reply to Jaquelot. When we think that these seventeenth-century combatants hurled folios at each other, we must admire their vigor and endurance.

"Not two strong men th' enormous weight could raise,  
Such men as live in these degenerate days."

All, or very nearly all, of them are dead books now, — *des livres qui ne parlent plus*. We of the nineteenth century look at these huge dark brown folios buried in the dust of libraries as we look at the relics of a mastodon, and wonder what kind of men

"Explored the deeps and shallows of the pen"

in that era. But the mammoth age of literature was then passing away rapidly. The epoch of the folio was soon to be overlaid by a new formation. The newspaper, destined to destroy it, had come into existence in 1631. Fifty years after, Bayle writes of the author of some big volume: "How can he expect to get readers in a time when one can hardly read all the mercuries, journals, and news-letters that swarm in booksellers' shops every day?" A new literature sprang up in France, and came to maturity as rapidly as the vegetation of an arctic summer. In his boyhood Bayle had little to read in French but Montaigne and Plutarch. Descartes had published his "Méthode" at Leyden in 1637. His simple, clear, manly style was as great an innovation as the philosophy it set forth. Corneille's *Cid* was played about the same time. In 1656, when Pascal wrote the first provincial letter, the "Vieux Gau-



lois ” had given place to modern French. Within thirty years after the publication of Pascal’s famous pamphlets, the French authors had become for precision, polish, and neatness of finish the foremost literary workmen of the world, — a distinction they may still fairly claim. The taste for books had kept pace with the increase of good ones. It was the fashion to be a *bel esprit* and a critic. The Grand Monarque was, perhaps, the only gentleman in France who would have asked, “ A quoi sert-il, — il de lire ? ”

Bayle made his first appearance before the public two or three years before the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. On the 9th of July, 1681, orders were issued to close the Academy of Sedan, — one of the four Protestant academies of France. When Sedan was ceded to France, all their existing rights and privileges were guaranteed to the Protestants forever, and Louis XIV. had solemnly renewed the treaty. But his confessors and his infirmities had persuaded him to abolish a religion *qui lui déplaisait*, and to make the Protestants do penance for his sins ; and the Academy of Sedan, in spite of the *foi et parole de roi*, was the first that fell.

Bayle was Professor of Philosophy. Deprived of his means of subsistence, foreseeing that evil days were approaching, and doubly uneasy as a *relaps*, a relapsed heretic, he looked about him for a refuge. The governor of Sedan offered him great temporal advantages, if he would again change his faith. But on that point, at least, Bayle seems to have never doubted but once. He was thinking of England, when an offer reached him from Rotterdam. M. De Paets, a councillor of the city, brother-in-law of Cornelius de Witt, and head of the party in Rotterdam opposed to the house of Orange, was desirous that his country should get the benefit of the learning, talent, and honesty France was so foolishly throwing away. He proposed to establish a university, to be called the *École Illustre*, and offered Bayle a professorship, with five hundred florins a year salary. Bayle accepted the offer, and remained in Rotterdam until his death. He gave the burgomasters some trouble and uneasiness, but it is doubtful if they ever regretted having called him to their new school, for his name was soon famous

throughout Europe. He became the President of the Republic of Letters, as Erasmus had been in the same city one hundred and fifty years before him, as Voltaire was at Ferney fifty years later; a position similar to that held by Humboldt in science in our time.

Des Maiseaux, a Huguenot who emigrated to England, literary executor of Saint Evremond, a man of letters of the same type as Jeremy Bentham's Genevese, M. Dumont, published in 1729 a life of Bayle in two volumes. "Elle ne devait pas contenir six pages," Voltaire said of it. It is a dull summary of his works. Bayle's writings are his life. He moved and had his being in books; and his mission in this world was to be the father of reviewers, and to write the "*Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*," a book unique of its kind, the like of which had never been written before and never can be again, — a book that, like Plutarch's moral works, will always be valued as a sort of literary curiosity-shop, in which all the odd fancies and speculations, the scientific theories, the superstitions, customs, stories, and mental *bric-a-brac* of the seventeenth century, can be found, as well as the views of one of its keenest minds on science, philosophy, politics, and religion. After Bayle's time learning became too extensive and varied for the grasp of one mind; but at the end of the seventeenth century it was still possible for such a man to know all that was worth knowing, and it is doubtful if there was any subject of interest then existing but what Bayle "had an honest sight in it."

His one passion was study; his only ambition, to read and to write in liberty. "Plays, pleasure-parties, games, collations, excursions into the country, visiting, and the like recreations, necessary to many students, as they say, are not in my line. I waste no time in that way. Neither do I waste time in domestic cares, nor in trying for place or for favor, nor in any such matters." Like Newton, he had not the time to get married. Soon after his arrival in Holland, when he was thirty-five years of age, a match was proposed to him by his friends, with a lady young, handsome, of good sense and good temper, with fifteen thousand crowns in her own right, who had no objection to become Mme. Bayle. He declined, giving

as a reason that his happiness was in study and meditation, and that the cares of a family were inconsistent with the pursuits of a philosopher. As to money, he had enough for his daily expenses; more he considered useless. On this view of life he acted, and succeeded, as literary men generally do, in obtaining a large share of pleasure and content. "I have had a leisure as delightful and as complete as any man of letters could wish for; and this appears to me to be preferable to anything else."

He was born in the South of France, the son of a Huguenot minister. A delicate, precocious boy, his reading seems to have been desultory until he began his "logic" at twenty-one, and entered the Jesuit college at Toulouse. It was not unusual for Protestants to send their boys to Catholic schools. The fathers made the most of their opportunity, as may be seen from this entry in his "Calendarium": "1669, 9th March. Change of religion. Next day I took up logic again." Logic seems to have done its work, for soon after we find this: "1670, 21st August. I returned to the reformed religion." As it was dangerous to change one's mind on this question in 1670, he fled to Geneva the same day. His conversion and his reconversion, like the similar experiences of Chillingworth and of Gibbon, seem to mark the period of mental development when Romanism is a satisfactory religion to a man of sense and character who thinks for himself.

While earning his bread as a private tutor near Geneva he studied the works of Descartes, and adopted the new system of philosophy. Three years later he went to Rouen, where his friend and fellow-student Jacques Basnage had got him a place as tutor, and in 1675 he was in Paris teaching two unruly boys for two hundred francs a year; moderate pay, it seems, even at that time. Bayle liked the capital. It was the only place, he thought, for a man of letters to live. The society of the learned, the public lectures, the libraries, delighted him; he also mentions, with approval, Poussin's pictures, Mlle. Rochon the actress, and a certain *potage de Talbot*. But his enjoyment of these good things was marred by his position. "I am sunk in a slough," he wrote to Basnage; "no personal merit can save a tutor from general disrespect." Basnage

came again to his assistance. He was finishing his theology at Sedan. The professorship of theology was vacant. Basnage, with the assistance of the Professor of Theology, the Rev. Pierre Jurieu, obtained the place for Bayle, who filled it with the general approbation, until the academy was closed. Bayle repaid Jurieu by recommending him to M. De Paets for a professorship in the *École Illustre*.

Bayle and Jurieu became the Eteocles and Polynices of literature. If fifteen years later they had been burned at the same stake, — an event which might have happened had they fallen into the hands of the French priests, — the flames would have separated into two forks, as in the Theban myth; but at this time they were fast friends. Bayle “honored and admired M. Jurieu,” and his *grandes et incomparables lumières*; and Jurieu confessed, in the hottest moment of their subsequent feud, that he had loved Bayle more than he had ever loved any other man.

The world soon heard from the new professor of Rotterdam. A comet of unusual size had appeared in 1680. That comets portended war, pestilence, and danger, especially to the great,\* was a universal superstition. Bayle wrote “Thoughts on the Comet,” to show the absurdity of this notion, not on merely scientific grounds, because “there are so many good souls to whom the soundest philosophical arguments are as suspicious as the allurements of the play-house,” but for theological reasons. “Comets have always existed, they were seen by the idolaters; if miraculous now they were miraculous then; consequently, God performed miracles to strengthen idolatry.” His main argument suggested all manner of disquisitions on almost every topic. Among others, this point was made, which he might have found in Bacon’s Essay on Superstition: “Is not the idea of no God better than the wicked, incestuous gods of the heathen? Would not God prefer that the world should remain ignorant of him rather than it should be abandoned to the abominable worship of idols? Has atheism anything to do with moral conduct? Has an unusual event any significance as a miracle, unless accompanied by the word?” The book was full of a good sense unusual at that day in such mat-

---

\* “When beggars die, then are no comets seen.”

ters. It ridicules all presages and omens, lunar influences and eclipses, unlucky days and unlucky numbers, and especially astrology. "The general belief in this folly makes one mistrust the soundness of public opinion." It was also noticed for its lively, attractive style. Bayle dropped the pedantry and magniloquence which had so long been the fashion in the treatment of serious subjects, and presented the public with a novelty, — "an author who wrote as everybody talked."

The "Thoughts" were published anonymously as the work of a Roman Catholic, and the style was carefully adapted to the character. Bayle then, and afterward took great pains to conceal his authorship by ingenious prefaces, changes of manner, and by employing different printers. "I have always had a secret antipathy to put my name to a book," he wrote in the Preface to the second edition of his Dictionary, "and reflection has strengthened my natural inclination." The Protestants, including Jurieu, were pleased with the "Thoughts," for it was easy to see that by idolaters Bayle meant the Catholics. In a short time it became generally known that he was the author of it.

Maimbourg, a French ecclesiastic, had published a History of Calvinism, very offensive to "those of the religion." Bayle wrote a "Critique Générale" of it. The great learning shown in this treatise, and its lively wit, attracted universal notice. It was attributed to Claude, and was so much relished in Paris, that Père Maimbourg, smarting under the attack, had recourse to the temporal arm, and obtained a decree that the "Critique" should be burned by the hangman, and that any one who should print, sell, or circulate it should suffer death. The minister of police obeyed the order, but took care to have a copy of it posted on every street corner in Paris, and all who could read the advertisement managed to read the book.\*

In 1684 Bayle began the "Nouvelles de la République des Lettres," a monthly record of new books, new inventions, new discoveries, intended for the general reader as well as for the

---

\* Jurieu also wrote an answer to Maimbourg, full of the old stock arguments against the Catholics. But Jurieu's book *was not burned*. Ménage said, in his "Ana," that Bayle's book was written by an *honnête homme*, and Jurieu's by a *vicille de prêche*, a fanatical old woman.

learned one, — the first specimen of the class of serials known as Reviews. Bayle was a born journalist and reviewer. He had the art of condensing the essence of a book into a few pleasant words. His learning, his fairness, his sense, his vivacity, and a certain modern feeling in everything he wrote, made his monthly the delight of the educated class. “A charming thing,” Benserade wrote him, “for lazy people to read your opinions of books.” The “Nouvelles” seem to have been the great literary sensation of the period. The Académie wrote a formal letter of congratulation to Bayle, assuring him that there was but one opinion in that body as to his merit, and the Royal Society elected him a correspondent and sent him Willoughby’s “Natural History of Fishes,” as a mark of their respect.

The Jesuits of Toulouse now learned what had become of their renegade pupil, and took steps to punish him by trying to convert his brother, a quiet Protestant minister residing in his native village. The principal argument they used was a dark and damp dungeon in the Château Trompette at Bordeaux. Young Bayle died in it of cold, foul air, and insufficient food. This and a hundred instances of cruelty equally infamous, and the crowd of wretched exiles who poured into Holland to escape torture and the galleys, excited Bayle’s horror of bigotry. He wrote a passionate pamphlet in answer to the clerical boast, “that France was all Catholic under Louis the Great.” In it he catalogued all the mean, malignant, and hypocritical atrocities the Catholic party had been guilty of, and held all Catholic Frenchmen responsible for them. Persecution was the most certain article of faith of the Catholic Church. “Could they prove any other half as well by tradition, there would be no answering them.” He warned them that their success would prove to be a triumph for Deism rather than for the true faith. This was soon followed by a book on toleration. He took for a title the text from St. Luke, always in the mouths of the persecutors, *Compelle entrare*, “Compel them to come in.” Toleration is an old doctrine, one that suggests itself to the weaker party; but toleration at that time meant, “We ought to be tolerated, but no one else.” Heresy was crime with Protestants as well as with Catholics. The Calvinists longed to persecute the Arminians and the Socinians. “Persecution,”

said Bayle, "is the *ultima ratio* of theologians." "To burn a heretic is the only point on which all theologians agree." Bayle took ground that even now we hold in theory rather than in feeling. He insisted upon the innocence of honest error, the rights of a mistaken conscience, and universal toleration even for Jews, Mahometans, and Pagans. "A correct life is of more importance than a correct belief. The best creed will not save the soul from damnation if its deeds have been evil." Both these books were published under an assumed name and character, and noticed in the "Nouvelles" as the work of a stranger.

Jurieu was violently opposed to universal toleration and the "indifférence of creeds." He immediately wrote an answer. "Such a doctrine," he said, was "pernicious," "a conspiracy against truth." He was "distressed," "struck to the heart."

If the mother of the Regent Orleans was right in saying that everybody was sent into this world to torment somebody else, Jurieu's mission must have been to torment Bayle. A coolness had existed between them since the success of the "Critique" on Maimbourg; it gradually grew into an enmity so fierce and vindictive on the part of Jurieu, that Sainte-Beuve has suggested as an explanation that Mme. Jurieu may not have shared her husband's antipathy to Bayle. But this hypothesis has no facts to sustain it; it is based only on certain *a priori* principles which seem implanted in the French mind.

Bayle was known to have been a man of the purest life, and not fond of the society of women. Jurieu was ten years his senior, and full of energy and fire. Imperious, irascible, quarrelsome, and violent as Achilles, he considered himself the Bossuet of Protestantism and the successor of Claude as head of the Refugees. He was one of those lucky men who know that they are always right. His cause was God's cause, his enemies were false to their Creator and traitors to the state. Boileau's verses were applied to him with justice,—

" Qui n'aime pas Cotin, n'estime pas son roi  
Et n'a selon Cotin, ni Dieu, ni foi, ni loi."

Although an enthusiastic Calvinist, his impatience of contradiction led him to catch up any argument that might do service; he was accused of reasoning from hand to mouth, and even laid

himself open to the charge of rationalism. With all, a popular preacher and so voluminous a writer that men wondered how his admirers could find time to read all that he wrote.\* Unlike the better class of Protestant ministers who followed the conservative example of Calvin in politics, Jurieu was a republican, bitterly opposed to Louis XIV., and devoted to William of Orange. He maintained the right of rebellion, proclaimed the sovereignty of the people, and ridiculed passive obedience and the divine right of kings. His *lettres pastorales*, of which great numbers circulated in France, encouraged the Huguenots to open resistance. He is supposed to have been instrumental in exciting the Camisard war in 1698. He had resided in England and made use of his acquaintance with persons and parties there to write against Charles II., and to stir up the French emigrants against James. Careful study of the mysteries of the Apocalypse had led him to announce that in 1689 the persecution of the Reformed religion would cease in France, and that the refugees would be restored to their privileges and possessions. Prodiges and miracles attested the truth of his prediction. "In the Cévennes and in Béarn angels had been heard to sing psalms in the air; in Dauphiné a shepherdess in a trance had uttered excellent and divine words, announcing the approach of the deliverance from bondage, and the spirit of God had fallen upon many young children in the like manner." 1689 passed and his prophecies were not fulfilled. He then preached war, and predicted that the time was near when the exiles should re-enter France, sword in hand, as the Waldenses had marched back into Savoy, and, nothing daunted by his repeated prophetic failures, he announced the fall of antichrist and the millennium for the year 1715. Like most noisy, fanatical, one-sided men, he had great influence with the lower classes and with the political party for whom he preached and pamphleteered unceasingly. It was asserted by his friends that the French government had tried to kidnap him, and this added greatly to his popularity. After the death of De Paets,

---

\* He left sixty volumes. Jurieu was often a clear and forcible writer. His "Soupirs de la France Esclave" was republished in the first years of the French Revolution as the work of a patriot. His "Histoire Critique des Dogmes" is still spoken of by theologians.



Bayle's patron, the Orange and anti-French party ruled in Rotterdam.

Bayle, on the other hand, had not a spark of the *feu ardent et sombre* that makes the enthusiast. He had "an eye for both sides," and saw too many weak spots in both to feel certain that either was entirely right. And Bayle was a thorough Frenchman at heart. Like Montaigne, Pascal, Hume, and Gibbon, sceptics as well as himself, he preferred monarchy to government by the people. The strongest dislike of which he was capable was for intolerance, bigotry, and dogmatism. These cardinal vices he found as fully developed in his fellow-exiles as in the Catholics. The conflict was never fiercer between the two parties than in 1690. It was political as well as religious. The Allies were making war against France. Libels on Louis XIV., as well as against the Papacy, swarmed in Holland. Jurieu and his followers would tolerate no opposition. "If you want to respect your religion," Bayle writes to a friend, "stay where you are. You will be a much better Protestant if you only see our religion where it is persecuted. You will be scandalized if you see it where it rules." "God keep us from the Protestant inquisition."

In the midst of this tumult appeared a pamphlet, "*Avis aux Réfugiés*," written apparently by a Catholic in France,—a letter of warning and advice addressed to his countrymen in Holland. The writer, after ridiculing Jurieu and the non-fulfilment of his prophecy for 1689, told the refugees that "if they ever hoped to come back to France they must undergo a quarantine before entering the country to purify themselves from the foul atmosphere of Holland, which has infected them with two dangerous and odious maladies,—the love of libelling and the love of republicanism, or, in other words, anarchy, the greatest curse that can befall a nation." "Libelling was a note of heresy in itself. The 'social contract' meant rebellion. The Protestant religion provoked and encouraged rebellion. England was an example. It was well that France had been purged of these seditious disturbers of the public peace, who were all ready, if it served their turn, to place the reins of government in the hands of the *canaille*."

The "Avis" exploded like a bombshell among the refugees.

It was considered "the most pernicious writing that had appeared against them since the Reformation." It was attributed to Pellesion, to La Roque, and among others to Bayle. Bayle denied it. In 1691, when the "Avis" was nearly forgotten, Jurieu suddenly accused Bayle of having written it, and ordered him to leave the seven Provinces. "Bayle was always the defender of James II.; he had no *amour de Dieu*, his only divinity was Louis XIV." "He was the enemy of Holland and of true religion." "As I have not the power to punish M. Bayle as he deserves, I will, at least, hold him up to infamy." He tried to move heaven and earth, synods and burgomasters, to do more. But Bayle stood to his denial, and Jurieu's efforts came to nothing, when suddenly fortune placed a new opportunity in his hands.

There was in Geneva one M. Goudet, a Colorado Jewett of the period, who had devised a plan for the pacification of Europe, and a redistribution of territory among the powers. Among other alterations of the map, King James, who was "unattached," was to reign over Palestine, with Jerusalem for a capital; France was to have Egypt and the island of Rhodes; and forty thousand Swiss were to be provided for at six hundred thousand crowns a year, as the army and police force of all Europe. Goudet requested Minutoli, a friend and correspondent of Bayle, to submit the plan to him and to a few other eminent men in Holland. Bayle looked at it and wrote to Minutoli that neither he nor his friends thought well of it. By some accident a manuscript copy fell into the hands of a book-dealer, who printed it. Jurieu read it, and at once proclaimed in his loudest tones that a cabal existed in Holland, a French faction determined to make a peace advantageous to France; that Bayle was the head of the conspiracy; he had written the "Avis" to prepare the public mind; that he, Bayle, was "an enemy to religion, a traitor to his fellow-refugees, and to the state that protected him, and worthy of public detestation and of condign punishment." Here was a very serious charge. To meddle in affairs of state was a dangerous business, and the Orange party, who were opposed to peace, were all-powerful in Holland. Bayle at once laid his denial before the Grand Bailli of Rotterdam, and asked for an investigation, offering to abide the

result in prison if Jurieu would do the same. Meantime he wrote the "*Cabale Chimérique*." "Jurieu had discovered a mare's nest; he contradicted himself; his accusations were as absurd as they were false; he had made them only because I will not believe his ridiculous prophecies, his false miracles, and his pretended revelations."

Jurieu, stung to the quick, appealed to the burgomasters for protection against the insults of Bayle; the judicious burgomasters begged them both to keep quiet and to make it up. But neither would keep quiet. Jurieu wrote and preached; and Bayle, worried by calumny and misrepresentation, lost patience and dignity, and insisted upon answering him. The feud went on until Jurieu found a way to strike a blow that could not be parried. He laid his charges before King William, who was the more ready to believe them on account of Bayle's old intimacy with De Paets, and the magistrates of Rotterdam were directed to displace the Professor of Philosophy, and to stop his salary of five hundred florins.

The Comte de Guiscard at once offered him one thousand florins a year, with a guaranty of full liberty of conscience, if he would return to France and undertake the education of his son. Bayle refused this offer and others, among them £ 200 a year from Lord Huntington. He had enough for his simple wants, and his time was fully occupied with the Dictionary. The first volume was published in 1695. Jurieu made the Dictionary the occasion of fresh attacks. He cited Bayle before the consistory of Rotterdam for his article on Pyrrhonism, on the Manic Laws, on David and Sarah, and for certain obscenities (*reflexions galantes*, Bayle called them), that disfigure the book. In this defect Bayle resembled Swift and Pope,—men of the most correct lives, like himself. Jurieu also complained of passages personally offensive. The consistory, after much urging, advised Bayle to suppress these passages, and to make various changes in other articles complained of. He consented to do so in the second edition; but his publishers printed the suppressed matter in foot-notes, and in the third edition it found its way back into its former position.

The difficulty of reconciling the existence of evil with Divine goodness, which Bayle has treated so fully in the "*Mani-*

cheans," led to a long and fierce controversy with Le Clerc and Jaquelot, both distinguished ministers of the Refuge. La Clerc attempted to explain the mystery with Cudworth's Plastic Nature, and Jaquelot made use of Origen's doctrine of the final restoration of all souls to happiness. Bayle demolished them both. It is said that Le Clerc and Jaquelot, instead of praying, like St. Ambrose in his controversy with Augustine, "for strength to break through the cobweb of his sophistry," held rather to the opinion of St. Jerome, that certain arguments are to be answered with blows, if reasons prove ineffective. They are suspected of having allied themselves with Jurieu to repeat in England the accusation against Bayle of sympathy with France. The old charges were urged upon Lord Sunderland with so much pertinacity, that he had determined to order Bayle's expulsion from the Provinces. It was solely owing to the interference of Lord Shaftesbury of the "Characteristics," that he was permitted to finish his life in his home. "The Republic of Letters," he said sadly, "has become a *pays de brigandage*." He died in December, 1706. After his death his great reputation increased. For the next fifty years the Dictionary was the *lecture des honnêtes gens*,—"a library in itself to most people." Frederick the Great called it the "Breviary of Good Sense." In his Essay on France, Goldsmith introduces Dr. Johnson, who asks leave to put his Lexicon in the "Fame Machine," or omnibus. The driver refuses to take it. "I have driven this coach, man and boy, these two thousand years, and I do not remember to have carried but one dictionary during the whole time." All of Bayle is in this Dictionary, even his quarrels; and the Dictionary, he said, could have been put into one volume if he had written for himself and not for the booksellers. Possibly, if he had lived in the same set with Boileau and La Bruyère, but the condensation and polish of Paris was not found in Holland. All the exiles have what Sainte-Beuve calls the *style réfugié*; and Bayle was diffuse by nature and fond of rambling disquisitions. To the modern reader much, if not most, of the value of his book lies in his curious anecdotes, his historical investigations, and his shrewd criticisms; for, as he said, "it is not what has happened, but what people say of what has happened," that is

interesting. But to his immediate successors all this was useless lumber, swelling the size of the book to no purpose. As Bayle had predicted, Deism and liberalism sprang up and grew in strength, until they ended in the atheism and anarchy so thoroughly expressed in the well-known verses,

“ Et des boyaux du dernier prêtre  
Serrez le cou du dernier des rois.”

The bigotry and cruelty of the Catholic party, and the close alliance between Church and State, made Christianity itself odious to the progressive. What with Bayle had been a friendly trial of skill in dialectics was war to the knife with them, and *écrasez l'infâme* their cry. In the Dictionary they found everything that could be said on atheism, deism, the Christian dogmas, and the various heresies. Freedom of the will, original sin, existence of evil, justification, and grace, “that ocean without soundings or shore.” It was an arsenal of weapons ready made to their hands. They placed Bayle on a pedestal and worshipped him. He was “le judicieux Bayle,” “l'éternel honneur de la raison humaine,” “un des grand hommes que la France a produits,” “qui a éclairé le monde et honoré sa patrie,” etc., etc. Yet Bayle had not given judgment in their favor. He took care never to offer his opinion on these vexed questions. He only said, “Here is what seems to me a difficulty,” or, “I suggest this objection merely as a problem to be solved.” His position was this: “Which-ever side you take in controversy on religious dogmas, you will come upon insurmountable difficulties. You cannot shut one door, without leaving another open. With sixteen centuries and one hundred thousand volumes before you, you can maintain or deny whatever you please. Who is to decide on the interpretation of Scripture? The Fathers, like the gods in the Iliad, came down to succor each side in turn, and to keep the battle going until darkness separates the combatants. Each party sustains itself by so many proofs from philosophy, theology, and the Bible, that it is difficult to choose between them. A sect that has been struck down can always get upon its legs again, if it drops the defensive and attacks. God appears to be the common Father of denominations, as of all things.”

This was enough; but more than this, he seems to take

pleasure in his iconoclastic work. He goes about it in such a cheerful, light-hearted way ! His tone betrays him ; it is not respectful, often irreverent. No pious man would have exposed the weakness of the cause he had at heart. We may see the faults of those we love, but we do not proclaim them to the world. Indeed, to inquire at all is the sign of a sceptical mind. Bayle felt this himself, and took his precautions, for the times were ticklish.\* How else can we explain his fierce attack upon the memory of Spinoza, unless he felt it necessary to "enliven his character," like Steele, who tells us that he wrote his first play because of "the rebuffs he met with for his religious doctrines" ? But the grand loophole of escape he kept always open was Faith. "Our reason," he says, "tells us these excellent doctrines are untenable, self-contradictory, absurd ; but Revelation tells us they are true. Human reason, in the presence of the Divine goodness and wisdom, is foolishness. Let us, then, humbly lay it at the feet of Faith, our only anchor and refuge. All that the good Christian needs to know is that his faith rests upon the testimony of God. The more Faith crushes our weak and limited reason, the greater her triumph. In what else does the merit of faith consist ? Where there is demonstration, there can be no faith. If I believe in the immortality of the soul and the heaven hereafter from demonstration, I have no more merit than when I believe that  $2 \times 2 = 4$ ."

The device, if a device, was clever, but not new. Many years before Pomponatius had said he believed as a Christian what he could not believe as a philosopher ; and his adversaries had suggested that it would be well to burn him as a philosopher and not as a Christian. Bayle's enemies took the same view of his case. There was no denying all that he had written about the excellence of Faith, but "whether a doctrine is orthodox or not," they said, "depends upon the intention of the man who teaches it." Bayle talks like the ordinary run of theologians, but he is laughing at them all the time. He lets Reason talk too much before he makes her hold her tongue. He ruins faith by reason, and then destroys reason by faith. He compromises both authorities." This was well put, but when Leib-

---

\* 1697, Aikenhead was hanged at Edinburgh for blasphemy, only eighteen years old.

nitz, Jaquelot, and La Placette undertook to show that reason should always bear out faith, Bayle scattered their arguments without difficulty. He even proved to them that the best of the Fathers had held precisely his doctrine; and that theologians who had recourse to reason had never been considered orthodox. Protest as he would, pious people instinctively felt that his book was against them. The Protestants accused him of betraying his party when he wrote the "Avis," and of driving weak souls into the Catholic Church by showing that reason was a delusion and faith the only sure guide. Bayle answered, that it required a faith altogether different from any he had recommended to believe that the Roman Church held the truth by Divine commission, and that the Protestants themselves refused the right of private judgment to those who differed from them. The Catholic priests, especially the Jesuits, in their "*Journal de Trevoux*," wrote against him and preached against him for at least fifty years. In 1750 Voltaire mentions that Père Garosse, of the order, had boasted of preaching against Bayle in Strasbourg with such effect, that seven persons burned their Dictionaries in the market-place after the sermon.

Bayle is said to have influenced modern thought more than any other man except Descartes. He was a shadow of the coming eighteenth century cast before; but it is not fair to hold him responsible for the witty warfare of Voltaire on religion, or for the brutal assaults of Paine. In his time it was not religion that was fought over, but doctrine. The wisest and best men believed that error in the most subtle religio-metaphysical speculations was a crime to be punished on earth by the civil power, and by eternal damnation in the world to come. There has been a great change in opinion on this subject. Religion itself is as sacred to us as it has ever been to mankind, but conduct is now considered of more importance than creed. Those old doctrines are as dead as the saints; even their relics have ceased to be revered. The superstition of dogma is felt to be as foolish as the superstitions of tradition or of ceremonial. Regeneration, justification, predestination, grace, watch-words then, are hardly catch-words now. They fall dead upon our ears. We are Lutherans, Baptists, Calvinists, from birth, habit, or prejudice. Few know or care to know the

distinguishing points of their creed. All Protestant sects might gather under the same roof, if dogmas only were in question. These are kept, like the church plate, by the preacher. But Bayle lived in the midst of the swarm of doctrines, "hatched by the long incubation of school divinity upon folly." He discussed the mystery of man's origin, destiny, and relations with Divine Providence with as little feeling as an anatomist when he dissects a body. He never felt the cut of the knife on his own nerves, like our nineteenth-century doubters. That he was an upright, kind, and benevolent man, no one denied. He fulfilled the customary religious duties, took the communion four times a year, went to the Prêche every Sunday, and listened to many "a good, honest, painful sermon." He risked his life and liberty, and gave up fortune and country, for his religion. Twice, at least, he refused brilliant offers from France. He had only to abjure to become another Pellesion with position and wealth in the capital of learning. That he was a sincere Protestant in the cardinal point of private judgment cannot be questioned. He warned the Protestants that, in not holding fast to that right, they gave the advantage in controversy to the Catholics. Nor is it to be supposed that because he had examined every system, he was without one, like the lady in Crabbe's poem: —

"The creed of all men she takes leave to sift,  
And, quite impartial, turns her own adrift."

A creed in those days was as necessary as clothes to decent people. Bayle was a Calvinist. He thought that the scheme of the Synod of Dort was, on the whole, sounder than *les moyens relâchés* of the Arminians; "and whatever system a man may fix upon," he said, "be it right or wrong, one thing is certain, we must do good actions, love God, and act up to our consciences." This will not be considered a very dangerous form of scepticism.

But his religion was of the head rather than of the heart. He had no *besoin de croire*. Much as he preached faith, he had little use for it. Giant Despair did not inhabit Doubting Castle when he visited there. He was incapable of that agony of doubt which once drove Pascal to toss up, to decide by heads or tails whether God existed and whether the soul was



immortal ; he had not a trace of that abject fear of punishment hereafter which reached insanity in Cowper. Bayle had an intense dislike of dogmatism, with no toleration for people who, having "made for themselves a God after their own image," insisted that everybody should bow down and worship him. He could not refrain from turning their own weapons against his noisy and bigoted fellow-exiles, and it happened to him, as to Diomede at the siege of Troy, he wounded a divinity with the sword he had drawn against wrangling mortals. Bayle hated confident ignorance and falsehood. "Never give lies quarter," was his motto. He shot at them "with arrows made of any wood," and sometimes, in the eagerness of his pursuit, ran them down on consecrated ground. The spirit of contradiction, or rather of reaction from commonplace opinions, was strong within him. To hear something loudly repeated every day, created an inclination in him to doubt, to examine, to deny.

"I know him, bless him," some one said to Charles Lamb for the twentieth time of a Mr. B——, whom he had never seen. "Well, I don't," retorted Lamb, "but damn him at a hazard." \* Bayle was provoked to write the "Avis" by the violent and disingenuous altercations of the refugees. His friend Basnage evidently thought him the author of it. He told Des Maizeaux that Bayle must at least have written the Preface and retouched the work. "There is no mistaking his ingenuity, his wit, or his style. There is but one Bayle." "It was *aut* Bayle *aut* *diabolus*."

In philosophy Bayle was not a sceptic. Bouillier, author of an excellent history of Descartes and his school, speaks of Bayle's "Système de Philosophie" as "one of the best of those excellent treatises on the knowledge of God and of ourselves, suggested by the philosophy of Descartes"; although he admits that Bayle did not always swear *in verba magistri*, and made some objections which none of the disciples of Descartes were able to answer.

There are three degrees of scepticism, of which Montaigne, Bayle, and Hume may be taken respectively as types.

---

\* This rebellious feeling extended to more serious subjects in Lamb as well as in Bayle. "The dogmatism of theology has disgusted Lamb, and it is that alone *he* opposes. He has the organ of theosophy and is by nature pious." (Crabb Robinson, Vol. I.)

Montaigne merely loosened the ground about received opinions. *Que sais je?* "What do I know?" was his motto. Bayle examined a great many questions, and showed that in these, at least, it was impossible to know what was absolute truth. Hume, from the very nature of the human understanding, deduced that we are incapable of arriving at truth. Hume was an *a priori* sceptic. Bayle would have been an inductive sceptic, if he had been a maker of systems; but he was not, partly from his anti-dogmatizing temperament, and partly from policy; for he saw the great advantage in controversy of holding no position that could be attacked. His intellect, bright, sharp, and solid as steel, delighted in the play of dialectics. He had trained off every superfluous ounce of prejudice, of sentiment. Since the day of Zeno, there had been no one equal to him in his rare combination of subtlety, learning, and good sense. He felt the joy a master always feels in the exercise of his strength and skill. He loved to set up objections, for the pleasure of cutting them down. He compared himself to Zeus Nephelegereta, the gatherer of clouds. His keen eye detected a fallacy, however carefully concealed, and he knew how to expose it by "happily hitting the one point of view" which made its real character visible to everybody. He was a destructive, not a builder up; the first of dialecticians, rather than a philosopher. Otherwise he might have gone far. He anticipated Locke, when he asked, "Why God could not have made the body conscious of itself. We do not know how he acts on the mind. We know nothing of substance, and arguments for or against materiality are equally balanced and equally incomprehensible." He anticipated Berkeley in showing that there is no proof of the existence of matter; for Descartes "extension" is as much a "mode" or an "attribute" of matter, as color and scent. The doctrine of the relativity of human knowledge is clearly set forth in his writings; there are hints, scattered here and there, which suggest Kant; and the moral of all his labors is that of Mr. Lewes, in his History of Philosophy: "Inquiries conducted on the metaphysical method are but as dreams."

Few of Bayle's "difficulties" have been removed, few of his "problems" solved. He may be answered by intuition, by

mysticism, by feeling ; but if we try to shape our feelings into syllogisms, and call upon reason to assist us, we get a dangerous ally. Reasoning in such matters is like the sword in quarrels : " They that take the sword shall perish by it." Religion is of " such an unspeakable comfort " in the cares and misery of this world, that to overthrow any form of it, even fetichism, unless you have something better to put in its place, is a sin against one's fellow-men. It cannot be denied that Bayle has written much that renders him liable to this reproach. But his motives may have been good ; he may have sincerely possessed the faith he extols. Who shall say ? Leibnitz, who had often crossed swords with him, wrote after his death : " It is to be hoped that M. Bayle now finds himself surrounded by those lights that are wanting to us here below, since there is ground for supposing that he was not deficient in good intentions." " Charité bien rare parmi les théologiens," was Fontenelle's remark on this.

F. SHELDON.

---

#### ART. VII. — FRANCE UNDER THE SECOND EMPIRE.

THE connexion between the First and the Second Empire is almost too obvious to need insisting upon. That the latter is built upon so much of the massive ruins of the former as had resisted disintegration, and still peered above the *débris* of intermediate dynasties, is an admitted fact needing no demonstration. The important question is, Of what materials do these imperial foundations exist ? What, to drop metaphor, are the ideas or sentiments, created by the First Empire, which have outlived it ?

Now, when we endeavor to seize at a glance the most prominent characteristic of the Napoleonic era, the impression first presenting itself is that of French *supremacy*, — above all, of French *military supremacy*. There can be no hesitation here. It is by this characteristic that that epoch of French history is pre-eminently distinguished from every other.

Closely connected with this idea of supremacy, although less